REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Amendments were made to the specification to correct errors and to clarify the specification. No new matter has been added by any of the amendments to the specification.

Claims 5-7, 9 and 14-16 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-4, 8 and 10-13 are cancelled. Claims 5, 9 and 14-16 are amended. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

I.   Summary of Inventor Interview

Applicants thank the examiner for the examiner interview held on October 10, 2006 between the undersigned attorney and the examiner. The rejection of claims as nonstatutory double patenting and under 35 USC § 102(e) and 35 USC § 103(a) were discussed. The examiner agreed that the filing of a terminal disclaimer would overcome the nonstatutory double patenting rejection and the rejection of claims under 35 USC § 102(e). The examiner also agreed to amendments to the claims that would overcome the references used to reject the claims under 35 USC § 103(a). Although the examiner would have to conduct another search, the examiner indicated that the patent application would likely be allowed after the claim amendments are incorporated.

II.   Nonstatutory Double Patenting

The examiner has rejected claims 5-7, 9 and 14-16 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 7,092,991. Applicants are filing herewith a terminal disclaimer for the present application (serial no. 10/615,164) to limit the term to the parent application, U.S. Patent No. 7,051,068. During the examiner interview, the examiner agreed that the filing of a terminal disclaimer would overcome this rejection. Accordingly, this rejection is overcome.

III.   35 U.S.C. § 102, Anticipation

The examiner has rejected claims 5-7, 9 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,092,991 to Kawase et al. (hereinafter "**Kawase**"). Applicants have filed a terminal disclaimer for this application, and, during the examiner interview, the examiner agreed that the filing of a terminal disclaimer would overcome this rejection. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 5-7, 9 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) has been overcome.

IV.   35 U.S.C. § 103, Obviousness

The examiner has rejected claims 5-7, 9 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,192,396 to Kohler (hereinafter "**Kohler**") in view of U.S. Patent No.

5,903,723 to Beck et al. (hereinafter "**Beck**") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,903,723 to Brown et al.

(hereinafter "**Brown**"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to claim 5, the **Office Action** states the following:

> 18.   Referencing claim 5, as closely interpreted by the Examiner,
> Kohler teaches an information terminal support server which supports
> collaboration of a browser loaded on a customer-side information
> terminal and a browser loaded on an agent-side information terminal, the
> information support server comprising:
> 19.   a rule definition part including a condition setting part and a
> command setting part, (e.g., col. 5 et seq., Figures 6-9, setting privileges,
> to users or managers that can be considered agents, on who can view
> specific sections of the email);
> 20.   a rule control manager for monitoring, at the information
> terminal server, messages sent in response to customer-side browser
> requests, (e.g., col. 5, lines 31-48, "*E-mail server 35 manages...*");
> 21.   an checker, determining whether or not said messages agree with
> a condition of said condition setting part of said rule definition part, (e.g.,
> col. 5 et seq., Figures 6-9, setting privileges on who can view specific
> sections of the email, when checked it is edited for that specific viewer
> therefore it is the email program also "checks" the email);
> 22.   an editor, editing contents of said messages according to contents
> of said command setting part of said rule definition part, when said
> messages agree with a predetermined condition, (e.g., col. 5 et seq.,
> Figures 6-9, setting privileges on who can view specific sections of the
> email);
> 23.   customer storing of said messages in an unedited form sent to the
> browser on the customer-side information terminal, (e.g., col. 5 et seq.,
> Figures 6-9, it is well known in the art that any email user can send an
> email to themselves, example, TO:, CC:, or BCC:, furthermore, storing
> emails on a server is well known); and
> 24.   agent storing of said messages in an edited form sent to the
> browser on the agent-side information terminal, (e.g., col. 5 et seq.,
> Figures 6-9, storing emails on a server is well known).
> 25.   Kohler does not specifically teach the specific use of HTTP
> messages and does not specifically teach the use of a cache storing of a
> message.
> 26.   Beck teaches the utilization of HTTP messages for emails using
> browsers, (e.g., col. 12, line 34 et seq.). It would have been obvious to
> one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to
> combine Beck with Kohler because providing an HTTP-only e-mail
> system, provided for e-mail services utilizing only HTTP, would give the
> need for no necessity of accessing a separate e-mail application in
> addition to the HTTP web-browser being utilized.
> 27.   Brown teaches the caching of e-mail for all of its users, (e.g., col.
> 6, lines 5-32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to combine Brown with the combine system of Kohler and Beck because caching information from the internet or any network give a user of the system faster access to the requested information. Furthermore, if there is local caching, it allows the user access to the information without further need of the network to which they are connected thereto.

Office Action dated August 9, 2006 at pages 5-7.

The examiner fails to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection because neither reference, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all the features of the claimed invention. The examiner bears the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on the prior art when rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Additionally, all limitations of the claimed invention must be considered when determining patentability. *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 1582, 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031, 1034 (Fed. Cir. 1994). In comparing **Kohler, Beck**, and **Brown** to the claimed invention to determine obviousness, features of the presently claimed invention may not be ignored. Neither **Kohler** nor **Beck** nor **Brown** teach or suggest all the features as claimed by applicants' invention.

Amended claim 5 is representative of amended claims 9 and 14. Amended claim 5 is as follows:

> 5.　　An information terminal support server which supports collaboration of a browser loaded on a customer-side information terminal and a browser loaded on an agent-side information terminal, the information terminal support server comprising:
> 　　　　a rule definition part including a condition setting part and a command setting part;
> 　　　　a rule control manager for monitoring, at the information terminal support server, HTTP messages sent in response to customer-side browser requests;
> 　　　　an HTTP checker, determining whether or not said HTTP messages agree with a condition of said condition setting part of said rule definition part;
> 　　　　an HTTP editor, editing contents of said HTTP messages according to contents of said command setting part of said rule definition part, when said HTTP messages agree with a predetermined condition, wherein the editing contents of said HTTP messages includes embedding a command in said HTTP message, and wherein said browser on an agent-side information terminal displays said HTTP message by executing the command embedded in said HTTP message;
> 　　　　customer cache storing of said HTTP messages in an unedited form sent to the browser on the customer-side information terminal; and
> 　　　　agent cache storing of said HTTP messages in an edited form sent to the browser on the agent-side information terminal.

The examiner fails to state a *prima facie* obviousness rejection because none of the references, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests all the features of claim 5. Specifically, none of the references teaches or suggests the feature of an HTTP editor, editing contents of said HTTP messages according to contents of said command setting part of said rule definition part, when said HTTP messages agree with a predetermined condition, <u>wherein the editing contents of said HTTP messages includes</u>

embedding a command in said HTTP message, and wherein said browser on an agent-side information terminal displays said HTTP message by executing the command embedded in said HTTP message.

The examiner admitted in the interview, and Applicants agree, that none of the references teach or suggest the feature underlined above as recited in amended claim 5 of the presently claimed invention. **Kohler** describes a computerized messaging system which allows an author to specify message content based on a recipient's role. In **Kohler**, the author edits the message content by highlighting or selecting a part of the original message. *See* **Kohler**, column 6, lines 21-36. The author then selects the recipients of the message content that is highlighted. *See Id.*, column 6, line 54 through column 7, line 3. Only the selected recipients can view the message content that is highlighted. *See Id.* All other recipients can only view the non-selected sections of the message content. *See Id.* However, the highlighting of a message by an author is not the same as embedding a command into the HTTP message as recited in claim 5 of the presently claimed invention. The highlighting of the message content is only a selection of a message. The act of selecting does not embed a command, as recited in claim 5 of the presently claimed invention. Nowhere in **Kohler** is there any teaching or suggestion that the highlighting of a message embeds a command into an HTTP message. Furthermore, the displaying of a message based on what an author highlights is also not the same as an agent-side information terminal displaying the HTTP message by executing the command embedded in the message. As shown above, the highlighting of a message is not the same as embedding code into a message. In the same manner, the display of a message based on the highlighting cannot be the same as displaying a message based on an embedded command. Therefore, **Kohler** does not teach or suggest all the features of the claimed invention.

Neither **Beck** nor **Brown** cures the deficiencies found in **Kohler**. Therefore, none of the references teach or suggest all the features of the claimed invention.

Since claim 5 is representative of claims 9 and 14, all arguments for claim 5 apply to claims 9 and 14 as well. Additionally, since claims 6-7 and amended claims 15-16 depend from claims 5 and 14 respectively, the same distinctions for claims 5 and 14 apply to claims 6-7 and 15-16 as well. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 5-7, 9 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome.

V. <u>Conclusion</u>

A terminal disclaimer is being filed with this response. Additionally, claim amendments were made per the examiner interview. Therefore, the subject application is patentable over **Kohler**, **Beck**, and **Brown** and is now in condition for allowance.

The examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: October 18, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Hope Shimabuku/_____

Hope Shimabuku
Reg. No. 57,072
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants